

#33

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO. C01041.70002.US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Wagner et al.
Serial No: 09/241,653
Conf. No.: 8996
Filed: February 2, 1999
For: METHODS FOR REGULATING HEMATOPOIESIS USING CPG
OLIGONUCLEOTIDES
Examiner: Jane Zara
Art Unit: 1635

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being placed in the United States mail with first-class postage attached, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on the 5th day of February, 2003.


Alan W. Steele, Reg. No. 45,128

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 24, 2003 (Paper No. 29) in the above-captioned matter. Please enter the following election.

ELECTION

Applicants elect Group I, claims 1-26 and 66-72, with traverse.

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 and 51-74 were pending. No claims are cancelled by this response. The Applicant, in response to the Restriction Requirement set forth in Paper No. 29, has elected Group I, claims 1-26 and 66-72, with traverse.

Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that all the claims of Groups I, II, and III have already been searched and previously deemed allowable. This suggests that the examination of the entire application has already been made without serious burden, and the examiner already examined the application on its merits, even though the examiner now asserts it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. MPEP 803 sets forth criteria for proper restriction between patentably distinct inventions as:

09/241,653

- 2 -

Art Unit 1635

- (A) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed, and
(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required.

The two criteria, (A) and (B), are noted to be joined by "and". For the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the criteria for restriction cannot be met because the second prong (B) of the criteria would appear not to apply. Without the required proper basis, the Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. A favorable and early response is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, she is requested to call Applicants' representative at the number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Alan W. Steele, Reg. No. 45,128
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210
Telephone (617) 720-3500

Docket No. C01041.70002.US
Dated: February 5, 2003
XXD: February 24, 2003

678968.1